be given. But it was hoped that the protection given would be such as to enable the Works to sell at Rs. 6-12-0 per cwt.

As regards Mr. Puttaswami's complaint that a lot of money had been already wasted on the Works and that any further investment would be like throwing away good money with bad, the First Member of Council suggested that investing some more money appeared to be the only way if the losses in working were to be avoided. As regards the guarantee asked for by certain members, the Member made it clear that nobody could give it. But it appeared to him probable that if the steel scheme was carried through, the Works could meet all charges on account of interest and depreciation on the new capital and also avoid the existing losses in working. This was subject, of course, to the hope that no unforeseen circumstances would arise in future. The entire question was under the serious consideration of Government and a decision would be taken when they were in possession of the views of the Government of India.

The resolution was thereupon put to vote and *passed*, 120 voting for and 62 against.

GENERAL RESOLUTIONS.

Resolution No. 1.

"This Assembly recommends to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja that a system of communal rotation be adopted in recruiting persons to Government services."

MR. T. MADIAH GOWDA, in moving the above resolution, observed that although the Government had accepted the principle of communal representation in the Government service and had passed orders in that regard, for which the backward communities were grateful to the Government, the required proportion of representation had not yet been reached in many cases. Further, as between the communities themselves, there had not been adequate representation according to their population; certain communities had received over-representation while a few minority communities had received barely any representation. There was therefore some defect in the recruitment rules and he thought it could be rectified by adopting the principle of communal rotation. Such a system had been adopted in Madras and had been working well.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL wished to make a statement before the mover completed his say. He said that the rules of recruitment were under revision and that the rules as revised would be published shortly. There was one special feature in the new rules. At present the Recruitment Board was scrutinizing all the applications received and forwarding all those which were in order to the appointing officer who selected the best qualified among the applicants. Under this procedure it was possible that in any particular department, candidates from one and the same community might happen to get all or almost all the appointments. This was recognised to be a defect and the new rules sought to remedy it. It was proposed to vest in the Central Recruitment Board the power to prepare a list of all qualified candidates belonging to the various communities and also indicate the order in which the appointments should be made. By this arrangement it was hoped that all communities would get a proper share of representation in the services. He informed the members that, in preparing the list of candidates, the Central Recruitment Board would have due regard to the principle of providing for the adequate representation of all castes and communities in the public service. There were other rules calculated to obviate many other defects brought to notice in the past. He thought that the object of the mover would be served when these revised rules were given effect to.

MR. JATHARE NAIK enquired whether due provision would be made in the revised rules for the better representation of the depressed classes.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL replied in the affirmative.

MR. H. B. GUNDAPPA enquired whether the revised rules would be placed before the Central Recruitment Board for consideration.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL replied that the rules had been prepared on a consideration of the recommendations of the Central Recruitment Board and therefore there was no need to place them before the Board again.

Thereupon the resolution was withdrawn by the mover.

Resolution No. 3.

MR. D. S. MALLAPPA moved the following resolution :—

" Since the recent order of Government directing the introduction of the Agriculturists Relief Regulation into all parts of the State comes

in the way of advancement of the State, this Assembly recommends to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja that they may be pleased to cancel the said order."

In doing so, he observed that the object underlying the introduction of the Regulation in the Malnad was to mitigate the difficulties and hardships caused by money-lenders to such of the debtors as happened to be agriculturists. But, when the Regulation was placed before the Assembly, there was a sharp difference of opinion among the members. Many had represented that it would, on the one hand, come in the way of the agriculturists finding money even for necessary objects and, on the other, interfere with the course of the money-lending business. But still the Government decided to go ahead with it and made it applicable to the Malnad, and it was believed that the operation of the Regulation would be confined to that part of the State only. But, contrary to their expectations, the Regulation had recently been extended to all parts of the State. It would have been something if at least land mortgage banks had been established in all the taluks of the State before application of the Regulation was made universal. But that had not been done. Nor had other credit facilities been afforded. The need for establishing land mortgage banks in all taluks of the State had been pressed on the attention of the Government even before the extension of the Agriculturists Relief Regulation. It had also been urged that Government must provide money at reasonable rates of interest to land mortgage banks so that the raiyats might get loans easily. Without taking any step in these directions, the Government had extended the Regulation. As a result of it, both raiyats and money-lenders were undergoing great inconvenience. Neither the raiyats could obtain money for agricultural operations nor merchants could get back even the moneys already advanced. The merchants, after all, were not very rich people. They themselves had borrowed money sometimes in order to lend, and if they did not get back their amounts, they would be unable to repay their loans. Already their credit had been adversely affected on this account and their business had come to a standstill. And in some cases, just to keep up their credit, the merchants had borrowed money at higher rates of interest. This opportunity had been seized by money-lenders from outside and much business had already passed into their hands. It was an economic truth that when coercive legislation was introduced in respect of money-lending, the investor would naturally prefer investing his money in Government securities

to lending to private people, because he had to make sure of his own money, not to speak of the interest accruing on it. Quite true to this statement, there had been a general shrinkage of credit and it had become almost impossible for private people to obtain loans. It would have been well if another Regulation had also been passed fixing the rates of interest. But this had not been done. Bigger money-lenders had not been affected by the Agriculturists Relief Regulation to any large extent, because they always lent on the security of properties and would be getting back their money in the shape of instalments. It was the merchants and petty money-lenders who had advanced loans without taking securities that were affected most. Thus, in effect, the Regulation was acting as a punishment on petty merchants rather than controlling the business of bigger money-lenders. The extension of the Regulation had therefore to be withdrawn. But if it was thought desirable that it should remain, at least necessary amendments should be made so that neither the merchants nor the raiyats would be unduly inconvenienced. If this latter alternative was more acceptable to Government, many points would have to be borne in mind, so that defaulters might not be encouraged to cheat their creditors with impunity. A resolution was coming up before the Legislative Council recommending to Government the desirability of appointing a committee for making necessary changes in the Regulation. Another more definite resolution had also been tabled recommending the amendment of Section 14 of the Regulation so as to make the properties of the debtors attachable in execution of court decrees. Further, there was a widespread feeling in the country that the time limit of eight years now allowed for repayment of loans should be reduced as it was sure to act as a hardship on money-lenders. Another hardship that they in common with the general public were experiencing was the proverbial laws delays. In Bombay they had made a provision to the effect that within 11 months every case should be disposed of. In Mysore, however, cases would be pending even for 11 years. He hoped that all these points would be considered and the Regulation amended suitably. If this was agreed to by the Government, he said he would have no objection to withdraw the resolution.

MR. P. SUBBARAMA CHETTY observed, in whole-heartedly supporting the resolution, that while at a meeting of the Grain Merchants' Association held recently, Sir. K. P. Puttanna Chetty, as Chairman, had made a speech describing the difficulties caused by the extension of the Regulation,

another meeting held in the Malnad under the presidentship of Mr. Hosakoppa Krishna Rao was strongly in support of the extension of the Regulation. No doubt the object of both the meetings was that the raiyats should be helped and their difficulties removed, but the question for consideration was how best that object could be secured. No doubt Government had taken power to extend the Regulation to any part of the State at any time they liked, but he was not sure if it was ever intended that the Regulation should be applied to all parts of the State. He was also not sure if Government had, before exercising that power, gone deep into the question. He thought that they had not done so. The Regulation had affected adversely not only raiyats, 90 per cent of whom were very poor, but also merchants, and not professional money-lenders such as Multanies who had come from outside and were doing extensive business in the State. It would have been all right if the Government had established land mortgage banks in all the taluks of the State before extending the Regulation. If they had not spare funds for doing that, they could even borrow the required funds. The credit of the Mysore Government being high, they could obtain money at cheap rates of interest. Even now, he said, if the Government had the interest of the raiyat at heart, they should establish land mortgage banks and afford all possible credit facilities to the poorer people. Unless that was done, he was of opinion that the extension of the Regulation could not be justified.

MR. K. T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR observed that the object of extending the Regulation was no doubt to save the raiyats from ruination on account of court decrees. At the same time the interests of money lenders had not been safeguarded. Both merchants and raiyats had their places in society, and neither of them could get on without the co-operation of the other. Nobody suggested that money borrowed should not be repaid. It was the duty of the debtor to repay. But, according to Section 14, there was no chance of the merchant getting back his money. While the creditor had been prevented from attaching the properties of the debtor, the debtor himself had every scope to alienate his lands. So, the effect of Section 14 was that neither the merchants would get back their moneys nor the raiyats retain their property. Nor would the raiyats be in a position to raise loans again. This, obviously, was far from the Government's intention. Section 14 should therefore be amended so as to give protection to money-lenders to get

back their moneys at the same time suitably safeguarding the interests of the raiyats also. The best arrangement he could think of was to permit decree-holders to attach properties, the judges reserving power to grant time up to 8 years as at present so that the money-lenders would be sure of getting back their moneys, if not immediately at least within that period. But, Section 14 should be made more explicitly consistent with this position. If this was done, the Regulation would be free from objection and welcomed by a large majority of people.

Dharmapravartha M. L. NAGAPPA SETTY observed that any legislation should hold the balance of equity evenly as between the rich and the poor, the high and the low. In the case of the Regulation under consideration, the interests of creditors had been subordinated to those of the debtors, although theoretically both were equal. It had been urged by the previous speaker that it would be enough if permission was given to attach property. But there were many difficulties in that regard, according to Sections 1 and 5. Whatever facilities the Civil Procedure Code, the Contract Act, etc., provided to the creditors to recover their just dues, had now been proposed to be taken away by one stroke of the pen, *viz.*, by Section 1 of the Regulation. As a matter of fact, the Regulation as a whole had operated as a hindrance to the money-lending business, and the interests of merchants had suffered considerably. As regards details, he said that for one thing the term "Agriculturist" had not been defined in Section 2 and this would give room for unnecessary litigation. Every one would like to call himself an agriculturist and seek protection under the law. So, every miscellaneous case would necessarily have to go up to the highest court and a lot of expenditure would have to be incurred by both parties, and in the end both of them would be ruined. Secondly, it had been provided that Section 2, clause (iii) might be made applicable at any stage of the proceedings. This surely placed a premium on dishonesty and enabled debtors to deceive their money-lenders. Thirdly, the provision about the application of the Regulation with retrospective effect was thoroughly unjust and opposed to the principle of equity.

In conclusion, the member observed that the working of the Regulation, at any rate in the Malnad, had altogether disabled poorer men from raising any loans. Its general effect had been to interfere with the course of normal business of every kind. He was strongly in favour of the Regulation

being repealed forthwith. The only alternative, he thought, was for the State itself to undertake the maintenance of all its people, in which case money-lenders would no longer care to carry on their business. He finally said that the Regulation should not be made applicable to the Malnad, at any rate to the Chikmagalur Taluk.

MR. HOSAKOPPA KRISHNA RAO, strongly opposing the resolution, observed that if the members of the House really called themselves representatives of the people, they should never make up their minds to support the resolution. The bulk of the population in the villages consisted of poor raiyats and the Regulation had been designed to secure their interests. He appealed to the members not to look at the question from the point of view of self-interest but from the point of view of the raiyat's condition. The basic principle underlying all legislation was the greatest good to the largest number, and judged by that standard, the Regulation in question was certainly fair and just. No doubt, at the time of its application to the Malnad, there had been much opposition to the Regulation, but latterly it had generally been recognised that the Regulation had proved beneficial to the raiyats so much so that public opinion was strongly in favour of it. It might be that, in the practical working of the Regulation, difficulties had arisen; if so, it was up to all concerned to consider how best they should be overcome. But, as a whole, the Regulation was a popular measure and would do considerable good in the Malnad as well as in the Maidan parts of the State. In this view, he was sorry that there should have been any opposition to it. He was firmly of opinion that members of the House would be failing in their duty by the raiyats if they opposed the extension of the Regulation. In conclusion, the speaker appealed to the House, in the name of all the poor people living in the remote parts of the State, not to oppose the Regulation but to realise that they would be serving the raiyats truly and well by voting down the resolution.

MR. BELUR SRINIVASIENGAR spoke in English as follows :—

Sir, this is a measure in respect of which objection has been raised in certain quarters. I now request my brother members, particularly my learned friend the mover of the resolution, just to recall to their minds the proceedings of the 1927 Dasara Session of this Assembly. The mover of the resolution is senior to me in this Assembly, and so far as his anxiety to relieve the distress of the agriculturists is

concerned I give him a superior place. But, so far as the present resolution is concerned I must disagree with him. His view that the Regulation really causes hardship to a small section of the Mysore subjects may be based upon a study of only a few Sections of the Regulation. I agree with him that certain sections, particularly Section 14, really work as a hardship on the vested interests of the money-lenders and that the contractual obligations between lenders and borrowers have been interfered with by this legislation. But I do not join him in asking Government to abolish the Regulation altogether. He has not made a proportionate assessment of, nor drawn a distinction between, the real good that the Regulation has done to the bulk of the people and the real hardship it has caused to a few. Any measure may cause certain hardship to a certain section of the people. For instance, if remission of land revenue is granted, it will be a loss to Government and a gain to the raiyats. In connection with the extension of this measure to all parts of the State, we must consider what the good is that it has done to the many in distress, more than the hardship that it may have caused to a few. May I ask the hon'ble mover in all sincerity, whether or not this Regulation has given relief to the hard-hit agriculturists? My respectful submission is that it has given substantial relief to them. But I do not say that the State has entirely discharged its obligation to relieve distress of the agriculturists by merely introducing this legislation. I am one with the mover in thinking that the State has not done its duty by merely doing so. A recent leading article in the *Times of India* gave us to understand that in Bhavanagar an economic survey has been made and the State and the money-lenders have joined hands in giving relief to the raiyats. A similar thing might be done here. But the present proposition is to withhold the extension of the Regulation. May I remind the mover that it was the members from the maidan parts, Mr. Venkataswami Gowda of Malur for instance, that prayed for the extension of the Regulation to those parts of the State as well? I know that those who wanted it were agriculturists paying heavy assessment, and so the motion to extend the Regulation to the maidan parts came from them. But there is no doubt that the Regulation has done some good to the agriculturists That the Mysore agriculturists are hard pressed for funds is admitted. Their indebtedness is acknowledged. If so, both the State and the money-lenders must join hands in relieving their distress. At the same time, it must be admitted that

the Regulation has caused hardship to the money-lenders also. The only remedy that I respectfully suggest for the kind acceptance of the House and the Government is to amend those sections under which the borrower has got disproportionate advantages. Also, let the State come to the relief of the oppressed by starting land mortgage banks in all taluks. But those are different matters. So far as this resolution is concerned, I have absolutely no hesitation in saying that no case has been made out for the total abolition of the Regulation and I therefore respectfully ask my learned friends not to pass the resolution.

Khan Bahadur MAHOMED ABBAS KHAN, who also spoke in English said :—Sir, my learned friend Mr. Belur Srinivasiengar, while appreciating the object of the Government in making this measure applicable throughout the State, has been emphatic in respect of the amendment of certain sections. But the pity of it is, he has not definitely told us in what respects the sections are to be amended. I beg to take this opportunity to falicitate Government on having extended the operation of the Regulation to the Maidan taluks. This Regulation was introduced about six years ago. It has been in operation for the past 5½ years, *i.e.*, from 1st January 1929. The whole country has been aware of the conditions under which the Regulation was introduced. So, I do not agree with those members who have remarked that they have been taken by surprise and that the State as a whole was not prepared to receive the Regulation. Government had rightly reserved the power to extend the Regulation to any district or area which they thought needed relief. The first and foremost object of this Regulation is to give relief to the raiyats. It means that all the sections should be such as to implement that object. The Government and the legislature have carefully worded them, and in their attempt to give relief to indebted raiyats, they have not sacrificed the interests of the money-lenders. Section 14 has been unduly criticised and all references to its merits carefully avoided. For instance, it provides that in case a land has been offered as security for a loan, the court may order the sale of the crop, the proceeds going to satisfy the decree obtained by the money-lender. Further, the court may order that the land may continue to remain in the possession of the mortgagee until the whole amount has been fully discharged. And if there be any doubt or dispute about the quantum of the amount to be discharged annually, the court may themselves

decide how much should be paid by the judgment-debtor. Further, if crops should fail in any year on account of bad seasons, provision has been made for giving a rebate to the money-lender. So, when a money-lender has advanced money on the security of a land, there is absolutely no fear of his losing the money. Even if he has not taken any tangible security for the amount he has advanced, he can proceed against the agriculturist and attach his movable properties. But if he is convinced that the debtor owns no movable properties and that he is unable to repay, I would ask my friend to consider whether, in that case, it is worth while to put him in jail. The second object of the Regulation is that the debtor should not be put in a civil jail and should not be deprived of the land which is his only means of livelihood. These two important features of the Regulation do not require any amendment. There are adequate facilities provided to the money-lenders. I could mention them categorically if time permittted. But, as there are others who also wish to address the House, I do not wish to take up more time. I shall therefore stop with your permission.

MR. C. N. NARASINGA RAO expressed surprise at the opposition to the extension of the Regulation. He was of opinion that the Regulation had been introduced not a day too soon since the agriculturists were heavily indebted and stood in urgent need of relief. He agreed that the Regulation required to be modified in certain respects. For instance, the word "Agriculturist" required to be defined properly. At present, even sahucars, merchants and many other well-to-do persons were calling themselves agriculturists and taking undue advantage of this Regulation. Government should see that only the cultivating raiyat benefited by the measure. But these were small matters and could be rectified at any stage. So far as the Regulation as a whole was concerned, he had no doubt that it was a beneficial measure and deserved support at the hands of one and all.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL, in replying to the debate, observed that the Regulation had met with opposition from the initial stages when it was brought up in the Assembly and more especially when it was introduced in the Council in 1927. But Government decided to go ahead, because they considered that the raiyat population required relief on the lines adopted in the Regulation. The Regulation was placed before the Council for a second time, when it was

1. In the Council an amendment had been tabled to the effect that the application of the Regulation should be confined to the Malnad. Government did not agree to that. But they agreed to apply it to select areas in the first instance, reserving the power to extend its operation to any other part of the State whenever it was thought necessary or desirable to do so. The law had been in force in those areas for 5 or 6 years past and it was seen that no great hardship had been caused to anybody. Nor had it been represented to the Government that difficulty was felt either by the money-lenders or by the raiyats. Subsequently, when the advantages of the Regulation came to be recognised, members began to urge in the Assembly that the Regulation should be extended to all parts of the State. But the request was not acceded to since the matter had been referred to the High Court for opinion. At the last December Session of the Legislative Council some members repeated the request for the extension of the Regulation to all parts of the State. Since then, the High Court had expressed themselves in favour of the extension, and accordingly the Regulation had been extended to all parts of the State. This in brief was the history of the Regulation.

As regards the points raised in the debate, the speaker agreed that sometimes both money-lenders and borrowers had been experiencing difficulties or inconveniences. But that could not altogether be helped. All exceptional situations demanded exceptional remedies. In America, for example, they had passed the National Recovery Act to meet the exceptional circumstances of the present time.

It had been argued by some of the previous speakers that the law sought to interfere with the natural liberties of contracting parties and that this was not just. He admitted that contracts must be respected as sacred, but he would ask whether there had not been occasions in the past when Government had to legislate so far as to interfere in the relations between capital and labour with a view to safeguard the interests of the weaker party, *viz.*, labour. This principle had always been recognised and acted upon in the State as elsewhere. Similarly in the present case, the legislation in question was meant to safeguard the interests of the weaker party, *viz.*, raiyats.

Other Governments had taken similar action. Bhavanagar, for example, had done so recently, as a result of which the money-lenders and the raiyats had arrived at an understanding compounding a total debt of Rs. 85 lakhs to Rs. 21

lakhs. They had also passed a Regulation similar to ours. In Mysore the Regulation did not take away any of the existing rights of the creditors. The creditors as at present could continue to institute suits and obtain decrees. All that had been done was that the land of the raiyat should not be attached, the principle governing such a provision being that lands should not go out of the hands of the agriculturists. This, he believed, was a principle to which all those interested in the agriculturists should agree. Another provision in favour of the raiyat was that he should not be sent to jail if he was unable to repay a debt. Thirdly, provision had been made for repayment in easy instalments. This was not an extraordinary procedure, because, the practice of repaying loans in easy instalments was already in vogue. So, on the whole, there appeared to be no serious difficulties arising out of the Regulation in question. It might be that minor difficulties were experienced by money-lenders, in cases, for example, in which any and everybody claimed the benefits of this law. To guard against such instances, probably the definition of "Agriculturist" had to be improved. Section 14 perhaps would have to be amended. The question as to what should be done for the realisation of the money after the decree for repayment in instalments was passed would have to be considered. All that might be done even now. Government had not said that what was contained in the Regulation was the last word on the subject. So, there could be no objection to make any modifications that might be considered desirable, so long as the raiyats' interests were not jeopardised. The matter would certainly receive full consideration at the hands of the Legislative Council and if necessary Government would appoint a committee to consider all those points. In this view he hoped that the mover would withdraw his resolution.

MR. P. SUBBARAMA CHETTY pointed out that the Government of the United Provinces had passed an Agriculturists Relief Act, and he thought that if the law in Mysore was based on the lines of that Act there would be no objection on the part of the members to the extension of the Regulation all over the State. He added that the principal point to be borne in mind was that occupancy rights should not be interfered with.

MR. D. S. MALLAPPA, in replying to the debate, observed that it seemed to him that many members had not understood him correctly. He had said, while moving the resolution, that if the Regulation was amended in certain directions he

would withdraw the resolution. Even those who had opposed his resolution agreed that the Regulation required to be modified in certain respects. It was not his desire, he pointed out, that the raiyats should be put to unnecessary difficulty. He felt he was second to none either in his sympathy for the agriculturist or in patriotism. But this did not mean that the Regulation in question should not be considered on merits with a view to ascertain the best way in which the difficulties of both the raiyat and the money-lender could be got over. And he had definitely come to the conclusion that Section 14 had to be amended as already suggested. If that was not done, he was of opinion that Government would not be safeguarding the interests of the money-lenders.

In the course of supporting the resolution, *Khan Bahadur* Mahomed Abbas Khan had said that where no tangible security had been taken for the amount advanced, the money-lender could proceed against and attach movable properties belonging to the debtor. But, the speaker would ask him whether any borrower who intended to deceive his creditor would make his movable properties available for being attached. Therefore, adequate facilities had to be afforded for creditors to realise their dues. The raiyats themselves were not opposed to it. In fact, at a meeting held at Tiptur recently, at which not less than 60 to 70 raiyats were present, they had expressed the opinion that the Regulation required to be amended in this and in certain other respects. And he was glad that this position had also been conceded by the Government. This was all his object and he would only request the Government to take early action in that direction. In the hope that they would do so, he said he would withdraw the resolution.

The resolution was by leave withdrawn.

DEWAN'S CONCLUDING REMARKS.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,

We have come to the end of this Session and before we part, I should like to make a few observations on some of the important matters which have come under our consideration.

Of the bills that the Government placed before the House, those relating to the levy of excise duty on sugar

and on matches were of a very important character. While the bill for the levy of duty on matches was generally accepted by the House, that for the levy of duty on sugar did not find acceptance. This bill is based on the bill passed by the Government of India which affects the whole of British India. We stand to lose if we do not introduce a similar measure in our State. Unless that is done, our sugar will be subjected to duty if it is exported to British India and the realisations will all go to the Government of India. By falling into line with them, we derive this benefit ourselves. It is true that, if all the sugar produced in the Mysore State was sold in the State itself, we might avoid payment of this duty, but as a matter of fact our sugar has a wide market outside Mysore and any attempt to restrict the market would be fatal to the industry.

Attention has been drawn frequently, in the course of the discussions, to the slump in the prices of agricultural produce and the consequent reduction in the money incomes of the landholding classes. This has been, as you know, a source of anxiety to Government for the past few years. But we may derive some consolation from the fact that the rainfall during this period has been plentiful, and that the effect of low prices has, to some extent, been counteracted by good harvests. It is true that large areas of land have been resigned voluntarily or otherwise, but these are, for the most part, current fallows or lands on the margin of profitable cultivation. It is a significant fact that although the area under occupancy in the State has decreased by 131,110 acres during the past four years, the area cropped shows an increase of no less than 83,751 acres.

The prices of certain classes of produce have latterly shown a tendency to rise, and if the world, as some competent observers believe, has seen the worst of the economic depression, we may hope that the return to normal times cannot be long delayed.

With regard to the demand made at this meeting for a general, though temporary, reduction of assessment, I can only repeat what I stated in my concluding speech at the last Session. Such a measure is scarcely feasible in the present condition of the State's finances. Besides—I should like to stress this point—while it would involve a serious loss of revenue to the State, its benefit to the small holders individually would not be appreciable. We have, therefore, been unable to accept the proposal for a percentage reduction in land revenue assessment. But we have adopted instead

what I may venture to describe as a policy of discriminating relief. Remission of land revenue has been granted on a liberal scale in all cases where there was a general failure of crops; several miscellaneous items of revenue demand have been reduced and the procedure of revenue collection has been relaxed in every possible way.

The subject of retrenchment took up a good deal of the time of the House and various suggestions were made. The budget for the coming year shows how careful the Government have been in this matter. In the course of our discussions, several instances were mentioned to you of the retrenchments effected by Government during the current year. We are endeavouring to carry out a policy of economy and efficiency in the conduct of the routine business of Government—to watch for small economies, knowing that in an organization as great as ours their aggregate will be enormous—to redouble our efforts to increase the efficiency of the services. For, efficiency and economy go together. I may mention that during the past few weeks Government have been busily engaged in revising the scales of pay in various departments and in reducing the number of posts wherever possible. Several important departments have already been examined and the scales of pay in those departments have been revised so as to effect a substantial reduction in expenditure. Detailed orders will shortly issue, but briefly described, what has been done is to reduce generally the pay of some Heads of Departments to about Rs. 1,000 to 1,200 and to fix the pay of the bulk of the junior Gazetted Staff at about Rs. 200—400 or 450. The number of officers in the intermediate grades has been reduced wherever possible. The rates of increments have been halved in most cases. Similar action is proposed to be taken in respect of the remaining departments. The savings that we may be able to effect by these measures, so far as we have been able to estimate them, will be some Rs. 4,00,000 a year. This result will accrue not immediately, but in the course of a few years. I should like to assure you that Government fully realise the imperative need of economy in public expenditure. At the same time, let us not overlook the fact that retrenchment beyond a point will impair the efficiency and purity of the administration, and will do far more harm than good.

I am glad Government were able to increase the provision for drinking water wells from Rs. 50,000 to Rs. 75,000. The improvement of rural conditions is one of the most urgent needs of the State. The supply of good drinking

water, the extension of educational and medical facilities, the opening up of the backward tracts and the provision of quick means of communication, the betterment, generally, of the conditions under which our raiyats live, occupy a very definite place in our programme. Financial position being what it is, it has been impossible for Government to do all that they would like to do, although, I hope you will agree, a great deal has been done in all these directions. Let us hope that times will soon improve and that we will be in a better position to realise our ambitions.

Reference has been made by more than one speaker, in the course of the Budget discussions, to the question of further constitutional reforms in the State. I should not have thought that it would have been necessary for me to make a declaration on that subject, having regard to the trend of things all over the world at present, but it seems necessary to do so, as I perceive there is a great deal of loose thinking about the matter. Let me tell the House that there is no idea of introducing any further changes in the constitution or of altering the structure of Mysore government. The Government are convinced that it would not be in the best interests of the people of Mysore or of the State as a political entity to alter the constitution on the lines contemplated by the advocates of constitutional reforms in the State. That is a policy which it would be neither practicable, wise, nor desirable to adopt. I cannot help expressing my surprise that this policy should have been advocated at a time like the present when Parliamentary democracy is decaying everywhere. This does not mean that liberty need be destroyed, especially in Mysore, nor that public opinion cannot have its part in shaping policy. I am speaking, of course, of the present and of the immediate future. I am not concerned with the remote incalculable future with which we mortals need not bother ourselves. I can answer for to-day—I can fairly well for to-morrow—the day after to-morrow I leave to Providence. I am sure the conscience of the State feels that our present constitution is quite democratic enough for all practical purposes. That constitution is the result of a long process of peaceful and steady evolution ; the fruit of ripe experience and careful nurture. In the past it has worked most satisfactorily ; in the present it is admirably suited to the needs of the State; in the future it will prove capable of working even more satisfactorily than a constitution based upon Parliamentary control. Therefore, I venture to offer this counsel to you

nd I trust you will receive it in the spirit in which it is ffered. Improve by all means what you have got when ny improvement is needed. But attempt no radical hanges. Let us, like practical men, check our ideals by ctualities; therein lies our success and our happiness.

I hope—and perhaps my hope is greater than my expecta-ion—that you will all agree with me.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I declare this Session closed.

On behalf of the Assembly, MR. V. VENKATAPPA hanked the Dewan and the Members of Council for the ourtesy and patience with which members had been heard hroughout the Session.

Khan Bahadur MAHOMED ABBAS KHAN proposed three heers to His Highness the Maharaja.

The meeting then adjourned *sine die*.

C. SUBRAHMANYA AIYAR,
Secretary,
Mysore Representative Assembly.

BANGALORE,
13th September 1934.